Columbia University Commencement Address by Hon. Allen W. Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently there was comment on the floor of the Senate when the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] received degrees from Columbia University. At the same time Mr. Allen W. Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence, also received a degree. At that time he delivered a very interesting address, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MR. ALLEN W. DULLES, DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE, ON EDUCATION IN THE SOVIET UNION, AT 53D ANNUAL COMMENCEMENT DAY LUNCHEON AT COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, JUNE 1

It is indeed an honor to be among those to whom Columbia University is today giving degrees and to have the opportunity to address this distinguished group of Columbia graduates, as the university starts upon its third century of service.

I have other and more personal reasons to feel gratitude to Columbia. Some 35 years ago I married the daughter of the head of your department of Romanic Languages. There has been no occasion for me to regret this or any other of the many pleasant relations which I have had with this great university.

Much of the work of the Central Intelligence Agency is focused on developments in the Soviet Union, and its European and far eastern satellites and allies.

Naturally, we are particularly concerned with information on the military and industrial strength of the Communist world. However, we also follow the cultural development behind the Iron Curtain, and recently we have been giving close study to the Soviet educational system.

If, as recent events foreshadow, there is likely to be more direct human contact between the West and the Communist world, the impact of our own educational system on that of the Soviet may become a factor of real significance.

So far this has not been the case. The Iron Curtain is not merely a physical barrier. It has also obstructed cultural exchanges. Not only have human being been prevented from crossing Communist frontiers; ideas also have not freely travelled back and forth.

The Communists have willed it so, and at vast costs in the diversion of manpower and in money they have erected physical barriers and jamming stations by the hundreds to keep the ideas of the West out of the Communist world.

The key to the future of any society lies very largely in its educational system.

Scientific and technical education in the Soviet Union today presents a challenge to the free world. But mass education in the Soviet Union may well become a threat to their own Communist system of government.

The Soviet have two educational goals. First, to condition the Soviet people to be proper believers in Marxist-Leninism and to do the bidding of their rulers. Second, to turn out the necessary trained technicians to build the military and industrial might of the U. S. S. R.

In the field of science the Soviets have made rapid progress and their accomplishments here should not be minimized; least of all by those of us who are directly concerned with our national security.

Twenty-five years ago, Soviet scientific education was riddled with naive experiments, persecution of scholars, and unrealistic programs. Only a small core of older men kept alive an element of real quality on which to build. Reforms in the mid-1930's raised standards considerably, but even so they were behind our western standards when the war came.

Today, that is no longer so. The Soviet education system—in the sciences and engineering—now bears close comparison with ours, both in quality of training and in numbers of persons trained to a high level.

At the university graduate level, we find that the entrance examinations for scientific work, at the top institutions, are about as toug has those required by our own institutions.

Also, we have the evidence obtained from defectors, some of them recent, who were university graduates. Although these men have come over to us because of their detestation of the Soviet system many of them still pay tribute to the technical quality of their education and appear to look back at least on this part of their lives with some pride and pleasure.

As regards Soviet scientific manpower as a whole, the quality differs greatly from field to field. But generally speaking their top men appear to be the equal of the top men in the West, though they have fewer of them, level for level.

True, their biology has been warped by Soviet ideology, most conspicuously by heresies in the field of genetics, such as the doctrine that acquired characteristics are inherited. Also, their agricultural sciences have been backward, plagued like all of Soviet agriculture by the follies of the collective system. What farmer will go out into the middle of a cold Russian night to see what ails a state-owned cow?

In the physical sciences, there is little evidence of such political interference. Soviet mathematics and meteorology, for example, appear to be clearly on a par with those of the West, and even ahead in some respects.

Military needs dominate their research programs. We who are in intelligence work have learned by now that it is rarely safe to assume that the Soviets do not have the basic skill, both theoretical and technical, to do in these fields what we can do.

In fact, at times we have been surprised at their progress, above all in the aviation, electronic, and nuclear fields. Certainly, the Russian's mind, as a mechanism of reason, is in no way inferior to that of any other human being.

It is true that since the war, the Soviets have been helped by German scientists taken to the U. S. S. R. and by what they learned from espionage and from the material obtained during and after the war. Also, recently the Soviets have developed, and boasted of, a systematic service for translating and abstracting major western scientific publications.

But the Soviets have rarely been slavish copyists, at least where a Western invention or technique was of military importance. They have employed adaptation rather than adoption, as in the case of their improvement of the Nene jet engine. In certain key fields they have clearly shown a capacity for independent progress.

While total Soviet scientific manpower at the university graduate level is about the same as ours—somewhere over a million each—about half of the Societ total were trained by the inferior prewar standards. In number of research workers—a good index of average quality—we estimate that the United States has a 2 to 1 margin over the U. S. S. R. in the physical sciences.

We must remember, too, that the United States has a substantial number of competent engineers who have not taken university degrees but have learned their trade through experience. The U. S. S. R. has no real counterpart for this group, just as it has no substantial counterpart for the vast American reservoir of persons with high-grade mechanical skills.

But lest we become complacent, it is well to note that the Soviets are now turning out more university graduates in the sciences and engineering than we are—about 120,000 to 70,000 in 1955. In round numbers, the Soviets will graduate about 1,200,000 in the sciences in the 10 years from 1950 to 1960, while the comparable United States figure will be about 900,000.

Unless we quickly take new measures to increase our own facilities for scientific education, Soviet scientific manpower in key areas may well outnumber ours in the next decade.

These comparisons in the scientific field most emphatically do not mean that Soviet higher education as a whole is as yet comparable to that of the United States. Over 50 percent of Soviet graduates are in the sciences, against less than 20 percent in the United States. Science in the U. S. S. R. has had an overriding priority.

Another important feature of Soviet education is the growth of secondary education at the senior high school level. By 1960 the Soviets will have 4 to 5 times as many secondary graduates per year as they had in 1950. These will be divided fairly evenly between men and women. Whereas, a decade ago, only about 20 percent of Soviet seventh grade students went any further, by 1960 probably over 70 percent will do so. Their secondary school standards are high and largely explain their ability to train competent scientists and engineers. Whether they can maintain these standards in the face of a very rapid expansion is a question.

So much for the advance in material terms. Let us turn now to the thought-control aspect.

The Soviets give top priority to preserving the Marxist-Leninst purity of their students. Beginning with kindergarten rhymes on the glories of Lenin, they pass to the history of the Communist Party, a comparison of the "benevolent" Soviet constitution with the "corrupt" constitutions of the West that do not confer liberty. Soviet economics teaches why the workers in capitalist countries can never own cars, but must always live in

poverty. In the lower grades civic virtue is taught by citing the example of a Soviet boy, Pavlik Morozov, who betrayed his family to the secret police and now has statues raised in his honor.

Even though it is hard to distort the physical sciences, they are used to prove the virtues of athiesm. In ancient history, it is the Athenians who are corrupt and the Spartans virtuous. In literature courses, selected works of Dickens are read as presenting an authentic picture of the present-day life of the British workingman, while Howard Fast, Uncle Tom's Cabin and the Grapes of Wrath portray the contemporary United States.

Everything is taught so that the student shall acquire his knowledge in Communist terms and within a Communist framework. But the Soviets are not content to rely upon the lasting effects of student indoctrination. They have devised in addition a rigid system for continuing their control.

To repay the Government for his or her so-called "free" education, Soviet law requires that each student upon graduation must work for 3 consecutive years as the state directs.

They may express a preference, but in practice only a small percentage of the students—those with high Government connections or with exceptionally high marks—have their requests granted. The rest must go where they are assigned—their niche in life largely predetermined.

Even at the end of the 3-year compulsory assignment, the individual still is under the control of the Communist Party, the Young Communist League, the local union, or the factory directors. To object to further assignments is to court an efficiency report so bad that a job will be hard to find. And if a man were to refuse an assignment, he would lose his occupation and be forced to work at the most unskilled and menial tasks wherever he could find them.

Thus, the typical Soviet university graduate gains little freedom from his status as an educated man. If he is a scientist or engineer, he will probably be able to avoid the military draft entirely. He may aspire to prestige and to much higher pay than his less educated fellows. But he pays for this by being possibly even more tightly directed than the bulk of Soviet workers.

Such, then, is the system, stressing high technical educational standards on the one hand while insisting on Communist philosophy and discipline on the other. Its ultimate human result, the Soviet graduate, must be—in the phrase given me by one of the best-educated of our recent defectors—"a man divided."

In time, with the growth of education—with more knowledge, more training of the mind, given to more people—this Soviet "man divided" must inevitably come to have more and more doubt about the Communist system as a whole.

In the past, we have sometimes had exaggerated expectations of dissensions within the Soviet and in other totalitarian systems. Our hopes have not perhaps been so much misguided as they have been premature. If we take a longer look we can foresee the possibility of great changes in the Soviet system. Here the educational advances will play a major part.

There is already evidence of this. As I have said, the physical sciences are being freed of party-line restraints. Within the educational structure itself, the pressure to turn out good scientists and good engineers has caused a de-emphasis of the time spent on ideological subjects. The student engineer, while he still has to pass his courses in Marxist-Leninism, can increasingly afford to do a purely formal job on the ideological front if he is a good engineer.

In the last year there have been interesting signs of this freedom spreading to other areas, notably to the biological and agricultural sciences. Lysenko is no longer gospel—I suspect for the very simple reason that his theories proved fallacious when used as the basis for new agricultural programs. The development of corn and of better wheat strains proved remarkably resistant to the teachings of Marx and Lenin—and in the end, nature won the day. After all, Karl Marx was not much of a farmer. Now Moscow is looking toward Iowa.

So far, this is only a small straw in the wind. But it is a significant one. If freedom to seek truth can spread from the physical to the biological sciences, we can begin to look for signs of independence even in the hallowed sanctum of economics. Certainly, every year that the decadent capitalist system continues to avoid depression and to turn out more and more goods even the most hardened Soviet economist must wonder about the accuracy of the Communist version of truth in this field.

In cultural pursuits, the evidence is not all one-sided. Literature and even music are still subject to denunciation and criticism for not expressing the proper ideals. But clearly, here, too, there has been some relaxation in the past 2 years. Recently, writers once denounced as bourgeois and cosmopolitan are being permitted to work again.

It is understandable that lasting freedom will come more slowly in economics and the humanities than where scientific matters—more open to proof—are involved. Ideology gives way most rapidly where it collides with fact.

This at times has caused the Soviet acute embarrassment.

We are all familiar with the deceptions the Soviets practice on their people, particularly in the rewriting of history and the adjustment of doctrine to fit their wants. Malenkov is on the downgrade, so the Soviet press removes his name from the key wartime committees on which he actually served, and replaces him with Khrushchev. Beria falls. His name must be blacked out wherever it occurs even in a university catalog and he must posthumously bear the blame for what Stalin and Molotov did to Yugoslavia in 1948.

This often has its laughable side. In the Beria case, the 1950 edition of the Great Soviet Encyclopedia was issued with a full four pages describing his as "one of the outstanding leaders" of the USSR and the "faithful disciple of Stalin." After his liquidation a few years later, subscribers to the encyclopedia received a letter from the publishers suggesting that 4 designated pages—no mention made of Beria—be removed with scissors or razor blade, and replaced by a large added section to the article on the Bering Sea and by a new article on a gentleman named Friedrich Wilhelm Bergholz, an obscure junker at the Court of Tsar Peter the First, whose alphabetical resemblance to Beria was his one and only claim to fame.

Perhaps most of the scissor-wielders managed to keep a straight face. Yet this kind of thing, insignificant individually, typifies the kind of dilemma the Soviet must face increasingly and almost daily.

We know that some thoughtful Soviet citizens are beginning to see through these distortions, and indeed through the whole process of thought-control. Yet that process may continue to have its effect on the masses of the Russian people. Will this equally be so when the average educational level of those masses is at the 10th grade rather than the 7th or lower?

Increased education must inevitably bring in its train increased expectations on the part of the educated. Since higher education in Russia had historically been only for the few, not only in czarist times but until very recently in the Soviet era, there remains a strong tradition that a boy who graduates from secondary school will not work with his hands. Over the past 2 years the Soviet press has repeatedly printed criticisms of students who refused to take factory jobs on the ground that they were beneath them. In all probability, the system is nearly at saturation point in the rate at which it can offer professional or white-collar jobs to secondary school graduates.

Ultimately, however much the Soviets condition a man's mind, however narrowly they permit it to develop, and however much they seek to direct him after he is trained, they cannot in the end prevent him from exercising that critical sense that they, themselves, have caused to be created in him when they gave him an education.

When Wendell Wilkie visited the Soviet Union in 1942, he had a look at their school system. In a conversation at the Kremlin he remarks: "* * * if you continue to educate the Russian people, Mr. Stalin, the first thing you know you'll educate yourself out of a job." This seemed to amuse the Soviet dictator mightily. Maybe it will prove to be anything but a joke for the Soviet rulers of the future.

For the Soviets face a real dilemma between the two goals of their education system; on the one hand making well-conditioned members of a Communist state, and on the other, turning out trained people capable of taking their places in a technically advanced society.

In some degree this dilemma has been present since the Soviets took the crucial decisions in the 1930's to go all out for trained technical manpower. It must become more acute in the future. The rise in numbers of trained people is only beginning to reach its peak, at a time when the picture for all Soviet citizens is one of somewhat greater hope and expectation, and when change is in the wind in many ways.

The broadening of the educational base within, the contacts with the outside world, the uncertainty in the high governmental command, and the absence of a dictator all force the Soviet Union toward compromises.

With these compromises, comes the inevitable admission that the Soviet Marxist-Leninist system is not the only permissible way of life. If coexistence should really become the Moscow line, the western free systems must be permissible and if permissible anywhere, why not permissible in the Soviet Union itself.

If the Tito form of heresy, denounced a few years ago more ferociously even than capitalism, is now to be forgiven and approved, how can the Soviet deny the European satellites the right to a similar heresy if they so desire?

Can the Soviets give their people a better material education and still keep them from wanting more and from thinking more on lines such as these?

I do not think we can easily give the answer in point of time, but one can say with assurance that in the long run, man's desire for freedom must break any bonds that can be placed around him.

Possibly for a time the Soviets will go forward, using their educational system as a sorting device for human assets. Half-educated men—all fact and no humanity—may still be good fodder for totalitarianism.

Possibly the Soviet leaders will encounter problems for which they will seek the solutions by foreign adventures.

But there remains the possibility that newly created wants and expectations, stimulated by education and perhaps by more exposure to the West, will in time compel great and almost unpredictable changes in the Soviet system itself.

One or twice before this present peace and coexistence offensive, the Soviet seemed to start toward adjustment of its system to the facts of life in the outside world; first in

the latter years of the war, and possibly again in 1946. These starts were quickly followed by a dropping of the Iron Curtain, by repressions, purges, and a return to the rigid Stalinist line.

Then the Soviet had a dictator, and it's hard to dictate without one. Today they have a committee in which the Soviet people themselves are not clearly told who is boss. Also today, the Soviet have gone much further than before toward introducing into their system the leaven of education, which makes a return to the Dark Ages far more difficult than in the past.

I would not be bold enough to predict that the Soviet might not attempt to return to the rigidity of a Stalinist regime. I do predict that this would be no easy task. In introducing mass education the troubled Soviet leaders have loosed forces dangerous to themselves. It will be very difficult for them henceforth to close off their own people from access to the realities of the outside world.

A hard choice faces the perplexed, and probably unharmonious, group of men in the Kremlin. They lead a people who surely will come to realize the inevitability of the great precept: "And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

"I Speak for Democracy"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I received from our distinguished former colleague from the State of New Jersey, Robert C. Hendrickson, now the Ambassador of the United States to New Zealand, a letter reading as follows:

AMERICAN EMBASSY,
Wellington, New Zealand, May 6, 1955.
Hon. H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR ALEX: A little lady from Auckland, New Zealand, a Miss Catherine Esther Styles, recently won an essay contest on the subject "I Speak for Democracy." She was 1 or 4 winners.

One cannot read the essay without feeling that in simple, but no less eloquent terms, she has stated the case for those who truly believe in the doctrine of free government. I think her 5-minute script is quite worthy of publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Thus, I enclose the same for that purpose.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON,
American Ambassador.

Mr. President, I am advised that Miss Catherine Esther Styles, the winner of this essay contest, comes from Auckland, New Zealand, and is an exchange student under our Smith-Mundt Act, attending high school in Minneapolis. She became 1 of 4 national winners of the 1954–55 Voice of Democracy contest, and she surpassed a field of 1½ million entrants. The entrants were high-school students from the 48 States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

Mr. President, in light of Ambassador Hendrickson's request, and because of the merit of her 5-minute essay on the subject "I speak for Democracy," which he enclosed, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is well worth the careful reading of all of us, and is a wonderful tribute from a young lady in New Zealand.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

I am not an American; my people are not American; and yet I, too, speak for democracy.

A NEW LAND

Not much over a hundred years ago the race that founded America began to found another nation. Surrounded by the vastness of the Pacific Ocean, a new land had been discovered. The brown-skinned people who already lived there called it Aotearoa, the "land of the long white cloud." Today we call it New Zealand.

It is a young country—a virile and growing country. It is a land of sea and sunshine, of snow on the mountains, of trout lakes and primitive fern forest, of weird pools where the boiling mud leaps and bubbles, cracks in the rock where the steam comes white from the insides of the earth.

The people who live there are a people who love freedom. The people who live there are my people, and when I speak for democracy I speak for them.

I have seen something of America. I have watched the crowds on the streets at night, seeing the advertisement signs flashing on the saw edge of the horizon saying: "Buy my product—no, buy mine, mine is finer yet."

SAME IDEALS

I have seen back home in the early morning the man with his horse and his dogs driving sheep. I remember the jostle and pattering rush of the delicate forefeet and the clean smell of the bracken and the sharp barking of the dogs.

I remember this, and I know that those crowds with their faces colored by the glow of the advertisements, and that man out early with his flock, although they are 7,000 miles apart, are people with the same ideals and beliefs, the same love of individual freedom. And I am glad that I can say this, and I speak with all the sincerity in my power.

I know that people, these people, all people, are the most terribly important thing in the world. I know that to make as many people as possible as happy as possible is the greatest ideal in the world. And I know that this is the ideal of democracy.

You people of America do not stand alone. Democracy extends further than America.

Two thousand years ago the Christian doctrine proclaimed the equality of man. Belief in this equality of man means acceptance of all races, all creeds. Belief in democracy means belief in the equality of man. It means respecting the individuality of every human being.

INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM

At home in the summer evenings near the time of Christmas, I would sit on the low verandah steps, and hear the baby owls calling in the darkness and the cows coughing and stamping in the paddock, and see the white bobs of the rabbits scuttle in the half-light. And by the gate I would hear the voices of a couple murmuring together, the young man and woman. And I would think: This is good. This is good, this life, this land, this people—all this is good, the best that ever was.

I still believe it is good, but I know now it was no single nation I was believing in, but the truth of free people everywhere. And I know that the most wonderful thing in the world is the freedom of the individual; in my country, in your country, and in every country.

Not as an American, not as a New Zealander, but as a free citizen of the world in which I have faith, I am speaking to you now. I am not remembering that you are American and I am British. I am not remembering that our voices are different and our manners, and the cut of our clothes. I only remember that together, we speak for democracy.

Address by Hon. George H. Bender, of Ohio, at Dedication of New School at Harrod, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at the dedication of the new school at Harrod, Ohio.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR BENDER URGES EXPANDED COURSE ON AMERICAN CIVILIZATION IN DEDICATING NEW HARROD AND WESTMINSTER SCHOOL

(School dedication address by Hon. GEORGE H. BENDER, at Harrod, Ohio, May 27, 1955)

I am very happy to be here with you on this important occasion. The dedication of a new school is always a happy event. When it coincides with a major holiday celebration such as Memorial Day, it becomes even more meaningful.

Perhaps the strongest single factor in preserving our Republic through 180 years of continuous problems has been the free American school system. Nowhere in the world has any nation made an even remotely comparable effort to provide education for its people. The boys and girls who grow up in our country, no matter where they live, always carry with them into maturity a reservoir of knowledge which they tap every day of their lives.

I know that in this field there will always be new worlds to conquer. We shall never have enough education. We shall always provide more and more of it for every succeeding generation.

It is sometimes amazing to people who come from large metropolitan centers when they meet brilliant young people from smaller towns. They often find it difficult to understand how these young people have gained their knowledge, their poise, and their determination to succeed. I never wonder. I have seen their roots in communities like your own throughout our State and throughout America.

It is wonderful to see new schools springing up everywhere in our country, offering the best and most progressive ideas of modern education. No one who has ever gone through a great school system can fail to marvel at the facilities and the opportunities offered to our young people today. This is an age of great technical advancement.

I have checked through a list of great atomic scientists. It is refreshing to discover that many of them received their initial training in small communities from all over the world. They were stimulated to